

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/761,355	01/16/2001	Randhir P.S. Thakur	303.275US2	6066
7590 11/24/2003 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O Box 2938			EXAMINER	
			BOOTH, RICHARD A	
Minneapolis, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
• ,			2812	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/761,355	THAKUR ET AL.			
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Richard A. Booth	2812			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the co	correspond nce address			
THE REPLY FILED 03 November 2003 FAILS TO PLANTHEREFORE, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	evoid abandonment of this applicance  1) a timely filed amendment whith a second allowed and the second at the second and the	cation. A proper reply to a			
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderns.	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE terms on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'					
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	or the appeal.			
		Yana NOTE baland.			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	· · ———				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	——· /			
10. Other:		Richard A. Booth Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2812			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the references has been plainly laid out in previous rejections (see, for example, the final office action mailed 8/6/03).

2